

INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COUNCIL

COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

COMMITTEE **Quality Assurance and Personnel and Program Standards**

RECORDER Peter Guerrero **DATE** January 25, 2001

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

PRESENT: Marie Kanne Poulsen, Co-Chair, Brigitte Ammons, Fran Chasen, James Cleveland, Toni Doman, Diane Kellegrew, Linda Landry, Wally Olsen, Lois Pastore, Kris Pilkington and Susan Lyons

STAFF: Peter Guerrero and Virginia Reynolds

DDS LIAISON(S): Ross Di Leo for Ken Freedlander

ABSENT: Susan Ferrell, Livia Faure-Gault, Fran Hill, Cheri Schoenborn (attended FSS committee meeting) Sharon Tettegah, Cindy Venuto and Julie Woods.

GUESTS: Janine Swanson

SUMMARY OF IMPORTANT POINTS & ACTIONS CONSIDERED

- **Introductions and opening comments:**

The committee was called to order at 1:45 PM. Committee members and guests introduced themselves and their agency affiliation.

- **Agenda Review:**

The proposed agenda was reviewed. Marie Poulsen suggested the following additions to the agenda: Continued discussion on Foster Care issues, SDR Committee update and EPSDT-MH report by Kris Pilkington.

III. Review and approve minutes:

Minutes were reviewed and approved with the following additions/changes: Toni Doman, Community Representative, was not included as present at the last meeting. Apologies were extended to Toni.

IV. FRC Referral Date Report: Ross Di Leo for Ken Freedlander
(by Ross DiLeo)

Ross Di Leo distributed a packet of FRCN data that was reviewed by Ken at the November QA Committee meeting. Ross responded to questions from the committee and clarified what the data represented. Committee members noted that FRC/Ns have made a significant contribution through their high numbers of contacts with families in California. Committee members stated that the report did not contain information that was in a meaningful format for them. There was discussion about the need for

clarification and increased technical assistance to FRC/Ns contributing to the report. Discussion was also held about the quality of consistency of data across locations.

The committee will ask for a joint meeting in March with Family Support Services and Ken for: 1) further clarification of the current report. 2) a better understanding of Early Start universal data collected and how it relates to FRC/N data elements, 3) a discussion of general data collection procedures, and 4) a discussion of reporting.

It was also noted that the QA committee concurs with the FRC/Ns request for funding, from the lead agency, DDS (via the CEITAN contract with Scholarship and Training Grant funds), for a data collection and reporting mechanism that would include:

- 1) Assessment of current hardware used by FRC/Ns.
- 2) Purchase of compatible software for FRC/N database.
- 3) Training and technical assistance to operationalize data element and the collection mechanism.

The committee agreed that it is important to keep data and use it to validate services provided as well as to guide future decisions regarding the early intervention system of services. The committee also identified the following areas to discuss with DDS the QA committee concurs regarding technical assistance:

- ❖ refining the data collection system for FRC/Ns,
- ❖ defining statistical data packages that can yield reports, and
- ❖ clarifying the questions the data is answering and uses projected.

A possible source for such technical assistance is Pat Gallagher at USC/UAP.

The FRC representatives on the committee noted that it was the FRC/Ns that initially suggested that data be collected. Now they need the funding and support in order to operationalize a standardized procedure across the Network. The following recommendations were discussed:

- ❖ a narrative section to be included in reports using operationalized terms,
- ❖ actual data from Regional Centers and FRC/Ns to be used which could be collected over a specified period (e.g. month of March or October or over a three month period), and
- ❖ data to be presented in a meaningful way.

Diane Kellegrew agreed to review the FRC/N proposal submitted to STRATEGIES, a funding organization in Los Angeles. The committee also requests that Ken Freedlander report on the committee's recommendation that a universal data collection form/process be established.

III. CDE Verification and ES Monitoring Procedures

Wally Olson reviewed materials on pages 28 and 29 of the ICC packet. He then turned the discussion of the CDE verification process over to Janine Swanson. Major areas of focus for the discussion included: 1) CDE Verification process designed to address ages birth through 22 , one district at a time; 2) DDS ES Monitoring process designed around

the 21 regional center catchment areas, therefore, can address multiple LEAs within a catchment area; 3) ES Monitoring process emphasizes interagency collaboration and family and professional partnering; and 4) Concerns about the duplication of effort between the two processes from an LEA perspective and lack of a unified reporting process for birth to three because of the two different processes.

Janine reported that CDE is not finding non-compliance in LEA infant programs. She believes this is likely due to the intensive focus on technical assistance by the CDE/Early Education Unit staff provided in the years prior to the implementation of the verification process.

The Verification process:

- ❖ Includes eight hundred questions that must be answered for each individual child's file reviewed,
- ❖ Is highly compliance oriented,
- ❖ Includes identification of systemic as well as individual student non-compliance issues, and
- ❖ Addresses five developmental areas under Part C as part of the Part B verification questions.

Concerns:

- ❖ CDE Verification process does not monitor interagency items (although interagency agreements are looked at),
- ❖ Some LEAs are being inundated with monitoring visits/reviews between DDS/ES and CDE processes,
- ❖ Question of coordinating the two systems and whether the two systems can verify or match findings for children under age three, and
- ❖ The family component on the IFSP is very different from the IEP parent piece elements. There is a gap between processes specific to parent interviews.

Members of the committee noted that CDE is doing good things in refining monitoring process for 3 - 22 year olds. The primary concern is about effectiveness of the verification process for children birth to three. Janine Swanson reports that CDE would like to get a copy of the final draft of joint monitoring reports from DDS prior to final dissemination to the sites.

Committee is requesting an interim sub-committee meeting with staff support to explore issues of coordination and collaboration between the CDE Verification process and the ES monitoring process. The goal is to see the coordinated interagency system of ES services under Part C reflected in a coordinated ES monitoring process.

Members of the committee that volunteered to participate in this interim QA meeting are: Wally Olsen, Lois Pastore, Jim Cleveland, Brigitte Ammons, Ross Di Leo, staff Peter Guerrero and Virginia Reynolds. The committee will also seek the participation of committee member Cheri Schoenborn and Ken Freedlander, DDS. Chris Drouin and Janine Swanson, CDE, will also be invited to attend. Staff will contact participants to

confirm date and location. Meeting date options are: March 7, 12 or 14.

UPDATE: The meeting date is March 14th from 9:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. at DDS, in Sacramento.

- III. Additional Issues for Discussion:** Additional issues were discussed briefly and will be put on future QA agendas. They are:
- ❖ Transition responsibilities of CDE for dually eligible and regional center ES eligible children starting at age 2 years 6 months. This may be discussed further at the interim QA meeting;
 - ❖ Stay-put decisions in California around transition at age three and implications for Quality Assurance;
 - ❖ Monitoring site visit update;
 - ❖ Value of monitoring visits as training mechanism for local Regional Center personnel to see how their RC and LEA colleagues work together. (Is there a way to systematize this?);
 - ❖ Dissemination of monitoring reports;
 - ❖ Request that CDE partners receive draft report before dissemination for input and confirmation;
 - ❖ Request that parents receive a stipend or other means of support for their time spent on monitoring reviews (March agenda); and
 - ❖ Development of a template to more easily analyze data gleaned in monitoring process.

III. Other Discussion Items:

Diane Kellegrew reflected on her experience as a member of a recent monitoring site visit team. She described it as an extraordinary way to experience the system from the inside. She also noted that the process is complex. After this experience the material in the monitoring process binder can be appreciated in a different light. One example provided was that many questions can be yes/no types that require multiple follow-up probes to solicit the desired information and there is a need for a data management tool to make the information gathered more manageable.

IV. Service Delivery Reform:

The QA committee members on the Service Delivery Reform Committee re-iterated the importance of following through on the inclusion of the ES Personnel Model within the SDR plan to be presented to the full SDR committee in March. To this end, a letter has been drafted to Julie Jackson, DDS and Chair of SDR Committee, thanking her for her acknowledgment of the amount of work that has been done on the model and the importance of the ES Personnel Model to the SDR and to underscore the importance of addressing birth to three through the inclusion of the components of the ESPM within the final SDR final recommendations.

V. EPSDT-MH:

Kris Pilkington reported on her success setting up approval of EPSDT billing for mental health services in the Santa Barbara area.

State Interagency Coordinating Council
Quality Assurance and Personnel and Program Standards Committee

Co-Chairs:
Marie Kanne Poulsen
Sharon Tettegah

Proposed Meeting Agenda

March 23, 2001

I. Introductions and Opening Comments

II. Review/Approve Minutes

III. Agenda Review

IV. Action Items:

1. Strategies for stipends for parents participating as team members on the ES Monitoring process.
2. Report of Interim DDS/CDE QA Meeting on program monitoring.
3. Joint Meeting with Family Support Services, re: FRC/N Data
 - Understanding of ES universal data base as it relates to FRC/N data
 - Collection process issues
 - Meaningful representation of data
 - Narrative components
4. ES Monitoring/verification sub-committee report
5. Monitoring process discussion
 - Templates for data gathering and analysis
 - Dissemination processes
 - RC personnel involvement from other communities
 - CDE review of report in draft form
 - Copies of report to ICC members
 - Issue list of areas of concerns identified by monitoring visits
 - Schedule of planned monitoring visits
6. Complaints: numbers and issues
7. Service Delivery Reform Committee/ Personnel Model next steps
8. Natural environments

V. Other

VI. Adjourn